UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,421	12/31/2003	Jos Jaspers	14012-051001/50-03-009	9571

26230 7590 04/09/2008
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER	
SHIH, HAOSHIAN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/749,421	JASPERS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HAOSHIAN SHIH	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 January 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,4,8,10-20 and 22-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,4,8,10-20 and 22-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-4, 8, 10-20 and 22-27are pending in this application and have been examined in response to application filed on 01/11/2008.

2. Claims 6 and 7 have been canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 3-4, 8, 10-20 and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by Giljum et al. (Giljum, US 6,745,238 B1).

5. As to **INDEPENDENT** claim 1, Giljum discloses a method comprising: presenting a user interface adapted to allow a user to configure parameters relating to a set of predefined components for a web environment (fig.12; col.13, lines 52-55; Item wizard allows the user to define and add new web components), the set of predefined components comprising a library of components that can be selectively enabled,

disabled, and customized (col.2, lines 15-16; col.8, lines 14-16; col.9, lines 23-35; col.13, lines 65-67; the content contributor manages the components).

receiving data defining the parameters for the web environment (fig.13, fig.14; col.14, lines 24-26; the user enters item definition); and

automatically generating at least a portion of the web environment based on the received data, with the generated web environment including components specified by the parameters (fig.15; col.14, lines 47-49; an item is added based on the user inputs). , wherein the parameter include data defining content for the generated web environment, and wherein the generated web environment includes a plurality of web pages (fig.13, "Description": col.14, lines 38-40; perspectives such as HTML web pages are defined to be associated with the generated web environment);

receiving a request to publish content in at least one of the plurality of web pages (col.13, lines 14-16; "add sub item");

presenting, in response to the request to publish content, a content definition user interface adapted to receive an identification of content (fig.13);

publishing the identified content in accordance with a predefined presentation format (col.11, lines 56-58; style template maintains the overall look and feel of the web environment); and

receiving data corresponding to a request to navigate to a particular location within the web environment, wherein the request to publish content is received in connection with a display of the particular location on a user interface and the identified content is published at the particular location (fig.13; col.14, lines 22-34; a user is able

to specify a content item to be published via a browse button, and publish the content item to a designated location).

6. As to claim 3, discloses the form comprises a plurality of entry fields, with each entry field corresponding to one of the predefined components (fig.13, fig.14).
As to claim 16, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 3 above.

7. As to claim 4, Giljum discloses the generated web environment is based on a template defining a presentation format for the generated web environment (col.11, lines 56-57, lines 63-67).

8. As to claim 8, Giljum discloses the particular location comprises a folder within a folder hierarchy displayed on the user interface, with the folder hierarchy corresponding to a logical structure of the web environment (col. 4, lines 6-7, lines 15-20; col.5 lines 18-20 the web site is organized as parent folders and child folders).

9. As to claim 10, Giljum discloses the predefined components comprise web page components, with each web page component defining a presentation format for data on a web page (col.5, lines 21-25; “attributes”).

10. As to claim 11, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 6 above.

11. As to claim 12, Giljum discloses the content includes at least one link to a web page (col.6, lines 6-8; "links").

12. As to claim 13, Giljum discloses: receiving a request to modify a logical structure of the web environment; modifying the logical structure of the web environment in accordance with the request to modify the logical structure (col.15, lines 55-60; user modifies the logical structure by adding a folder); and updating the at least one link in accordance with the modified logical structure (col.16, lines 5-9; updates are reflected when the user clicks the "done" icon).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claim 14-27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giljum and Sumitomo (US 7,234,110 B2).

15. As to **INDEPENDENT** claim 14, presenting a user interface adapted to allow a user to configure parameters relating to a set of predefined components for a web environment (fig.12; col.13, lines 52-55; Item wizard allows the user to define and add new web components), the set of predefined components comprising a library of

components that can be selectively enabled, disabled, and customized (col.2, lines 15-16; col.8, lines 14-16; col.9, lines 23-35; col.13, lines 65-67; the content contributor manages the components).

receiving data defining the parameters for the web environment (fig.13, fig.14; col.14, lines 24-26; the user enters item definition); and

automatically generating at least a portion of the web environment based on the received data, with the generated web environment including components specified by the parameters (fig.15; col.14, lines 47-49; an item is added based on the user inputs).

Giljum does not disclose wherein the library of components include predefined components defined in different languages; and allowing a user to selectively switch among the different languages for presentation in the generated web environment.

In the same field of endeavor, Sumitomo discloses wherein the library of components include predefined components defined in different languages (col.6, lines 32-63); and

allowing a user to selectively switch among the different languages for presentation in the generated web environment (col.5, lines 1-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Giljum and Sumitomo before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the web designer taught by Giljum to include multilingual pack taught by Sumitomo with the

motivation being to allow an appropriate language format responsive to the user's need (Sumitomo, col.2, lines 25-30).

16. As to claim 15, Giljum discloses the presented user interface comprises a form adapted to allow a user to configure the parameters (fig.12; col.13, lines 52-55).

17. As to claim 16, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 3 above.

18. As to claim 17, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 4 above.

19. As to claim 18, Giljum discloses the generated web environment comprises a plurality of web pages, the method further comprising: receiving a request to publish content in at least one of the plurality of web pages presenting (col.13, lines 14-16; "add sub item"), in response to the request to publish content, a content definition user interface adapted to receive an identification of content (fig.13); and publishing the identified content in accordance with a predefined presentation format (col.11, lines 56-58; style template maintains the overall look and feel of the web environment).

20. As to claim 19, Giljum discloses receiving data corresponding to a request to navigate to a particular location within the web environment, wherein the request to publish content is received in connection with a display of the particular location on a user interface and the identified content is published at the particular location (fig.13;

col.14, lines 22-34; a user is able to specify a content item to be published via a browse button, and publish the content item to a designated location).

21. As to claim 20, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 8 above.

22. As to claim 22, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 10 above.

23. As to claim 23, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 18 above.

24. As to claim 24, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 12 above.

25. As to claim 25, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 13 above.

26. As to claim 26, Giljum discloses wherein the templates include templates for at least one of different countries, different organizational sites, intranet sites, extranet sites, or internet sites (fig.35, “select style”; col.11, lines 63-67, a user can select or create a custom style template from the web site database).

27. As to claim 27, Giljum discloses wherein the library of components include predefined components. Giljum does not disclose different language components to allow a user to selectively switch among different languages for presentation in generated web environment.

In the same field of endeavor, Sumitomo discloses different language components to allow a user to selectively switch among different languages for presentation in generated web environment (col.4, lines 51-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Giljum and Sumitomo before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the web designer taught by Giljum to include multilingual pack taught by Sumitomo with the motivation being to allow an appropriate language format responsive to the user's need (Sumitomo, col.2, lines 25-30).

Response to Arguments

28. Applicant's arguments filed 01/11/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Giljum does not disclose receiving data corresponding to a request to navigate to a particular location within the web environment, wherein the request to publish content is received in connection with a display of the particular location on a user interface and the identified content is published at the particular location.

In response to applicant's argument, Giljum discloses receiving data corresponding to a request to navigate to a particular location within the web environment (fig.13; fig.15; col.14, lines 22-35; a user is able to assign a content item titled "WebDB content management proposal" via a browse button to allow the content item to be published under the "Specification" area).

Applicant argues that Giljum and Sumitomo do not disclose wherein the library of components include predefined components defined in different languages to allow a user to selectively switch among the different languages for presentation in the generated web environment.

In response to applicant's argument, Giljum discloses predefined components defined in a language ((fig.12; col.13, lines 52-55; Item wizard allows the user to define and add new web components). Giljum does not disclose the feature of predefining the components in different languages to allow a user to selectively switch among the different languages for presentation in the generated web environment.
Sumitomo discloses predefining components in different languages wherein upon a user request to selectively switch to a different language (col.5, lines 1-6), predefined resource files that described in a plurality of languages (col.5, lines 25-29) are requested, each components of a page to be displayed are mapped to the predefined resource in the corresponding resource files for presentation of a user selected language in a generated web environment (col.6, lines 32-63).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HAOSHIAN SHIH whose telephone number is (571)270-1257. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 0730-1700.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow can be reached on (571) 272-7767. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tadesse Hailu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2173

HSS